

LAW OFFICES  
**COHN AND MARKS**

STANLEY S. NEUSTADT  
RICHARD M. SCHMIDT, JR.  
JOEL H. LEVY  
ROBERT B. JACOBI  
ROY R. RUSSO  
RONALD A. SIEGEL  
LAWRENCE N. COHN  
RICHARD A. HELMICK  
WAYNE COY, JR.

MARK L. PELESH  
J. BRIAN DE BOICE  
ALLAN ROBERT ADLER  
CHARLES M. OLIVER  
  
SUSAN V. SACHS  
JOHN R. PRZYPYSZNY

OF COUNSEL  
MARCUS COHN  
LEONARD H. MARKS  
STANLEY B. COHEN

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
SUITE 600

1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-1573

TELEPHONE (202) 293-3860  
TELECOPIER (202) 293-4827

DIRECT DIAL: (202) 452-4817  
INTERNET ADDRESS:

May 17, 1995

Mr. William F. Caton  
Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 222  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Caton

On behalf of Louisiana Television Broadcasting Corp., there are herewith submitted an original and five (5) copies of its Comments in MM Docket No. 91-221.

Sincerely

  
Lawrence N. Cohn

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd 045  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED  
MAY 17 1995  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

RECEIVED

MAY 17 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

BEFORE THE

# Federal Communications Commission

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Review of the Commission's ) MM Docket No. 91-221  
Regulations Governing Television )  
Broadcasting )

To: The Commission

## COMMENTS

Louisiana Television Broadcasting Corp. ("Louisiana"), licensee of Television Station WBRZ, Baton Rouge, Louisiana<sup>1/</sup>, by its counsel, hereby submits its Comments in response to the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FCC 94-322) ("FNPRM") issued by the Commission on January 17, 1995, in the above-captioned proceeding. Louisiana's comments regarding the proposals to change the local ownership aspects of the Commission's multiple ownership rules are set forth below.

---

<sup>1/</sup> The principals of the Manship family who own Louisiana also own the separate entity which is the licensee of Station KRGV-TV, Weslaco, Texas. They also own Capitol City Press, which publishes daily (Monday-Saturday) morning and Sunday morning newspapers in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

I. Summary

Louisiana's comments are primarily directed toward the issue raised in the FNPRM of whether, and if so under what circumstances, a single entity should be allowed to own, operate, or control (hereinafter referred to for purposes of simplicity as "own") more than one television broadcast station in a single market (FNPRM, Paras. 116-123). On this issue, Louisiana believes that the Commission should change its rules to allow an entity to own a UHF/UHF or UHF/VHF combination of TV broadcast stations in the same market without any restriction.

However, in the event the Commission declines to change its rules in this manner, Louisiana proposes that the Commission allow such UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF joint ownership in circumstances where there are "substantial independent competing media" in the relevant market (as defined below). Finally, if the Commission determines that it will not allow joint ownership of UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF television stations in a market, Louisiana supports the Commission's proposal (advanced in the FNPRM) to utilize the Grade A contours of television broadcast stations to determine whether television stations are sufficiently close to be of concern for purposes of local concentration of control purposes.

On a separate subject, Louisiana supports the Commission's proposal to treat television LMA's similar to the way it treats radio LMA's; however, it believes that television LMA's entered prior to the effective date of the adoption of the television LMA rules, not merely those entered before the FNPRM was adopted, should be given "grandfathered" status.

Louisiana also comments on one issue not expressly raised in the FNPRM, but which it believes should be considered by the Commission in the context of this proceeding; namely, whether, and if so under what circumstances, a single entity should be allowed to own both a television broadcast station and a daily newspaper of general circulation in the same market. On this point, Louisiana believes that the Commission should change its current rule, which absolutely prohibits new newspaper/television combinations in the same market, and should allow a single entity to own television broadcast facilities and a daily newspaper published in the same market in circumstances where there is "substantial independent competing media" (as defined below).

II. The Commission Should Eliminate the Television "One-to-a-Market" Rule Insofar As It Pertains to UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF Combinations.

Louisiana's views flow from its fundamental belief that in many situations, if the Commission were to allow entities to own

more than one television broadcast station in a market, it would ultimately have favorable public interest ramifications because of the savings which would be realized by the joint operation of the stations. This principle is not in dispute; indeed, the Commission recognized forcefulness of this point in the FNPRM when it wrote the following (at Para. 107):

joint ownership of stations in the same market permits cost-sharing in administrative and overhead expenses, sharing of personnel, joint advertising sales, and the pooling of resources for local program production (such as news and public affairs programming). We believe the cost savings from these economies could then be used to provide better programming to the public.

Thus, comments such as these, which urge the relaxation of the Commission's multiple ownership regulations, must not be treated as merely self-serving statements, but should be favorably considered by the Commission because relaxation of the multiple ownership restrictions would affirmatively serve the public interest by promoting efficiency and making funds available for additional news, public affairs, and other public service programming.

Louisiana believes that the weight of experience in analogous situations has shown the value of such joint television operations. Specifically, combinations of two television stations under Local Marketing Agreements (or "LMA's"), which are currently not the

subject of Commission regulation, have allowed several stations which were either off the air or operating under extremely restricted financial circumstances, to become economically viable and to thereby enhance the diversity of programming available in their markets. Indeed, local news and local issue-oriented programming which may have been totally absent or available only in limited amounts, are more likely to increase under dual ownership. Similarly, the Commission's experience with the waiver of the radio/television cross-ownership prohibition in the context of "failed stations" and stations in the top 25 markets with 30 or more independent broadcast voices<sup>2/</sup> shows that such combinations can, and often do, result in an increase in programming diversity. Therefore, Louisiana believes that the weight of experience strongly suggests that the complete elimination of the television overlap rule, insofar as it applies to UHF-UHF and UHF-VHF combinations, would promote the public interest. The public interest would best be served by reliance on the anti-trust laws to stop combinations which are likely to have significant anti-competitive ramifications.

---

<sup>2/</sup> See Section 73.3555, Note 7.

However, Louisiana appreciates the Commission's concern that entities not be allowed to create a television station combination in a market where that combination would significantly detract from economic competition and diversity of programming viewpoint. Louisiana believes that if the Commission is determined to retain any restrictions on such combinations, it should not adopt a single rule which is designed to be applicable in all situations, and which would treat all markets as though they were the same or similar. The flaw in such an approach is that it fails to recognize the fundamentally important point that while in some (smaller) markets the combination of two TV broadcast stations almost conceivably have an adverse impact on economic competition and viewpoint diversity, in other (larger) markets the effects of the same television broadcast station combination would almost certainly be minimal (at most). Any restrictive rules adopted by the Commission in this proceeding must recognize that one size does not fit all, and should take into account that at least in some situations, it is a virtual certainty that a combination of television broadcast stations in a market would provide major benefits to the public which would outweigh any negative consequences which might result from any slight reduction of economic competition and viewpoint diversity.

Accordingly, Louisiana believes that if the Commission is unwilling to allow all UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF combinations without restriction, it should adopt television cross-ownership rules which vary from market to market, and which allow a single entity to own any UHF/VHF or UHF/UHF combination if the applicant is able to demonstrate to the Commission's satisfaction that, apart from the stations proposed for joint ownership,<sup>3/</sup> there are a substantial number of other "independent competing media" in the market. For these purposes, Louisiana proposes that the following be considered as "competing media."<sup>4/</sup>

1) Other TV broadcast stations in the DMA (excluding the ones which are the subject of the proposed combination). For this purpose, the Commission would consider all full-power television broadcast stations located in the A.C. Neilson Designated Market Area ("DMA") of the stations (or either of them if they are in different DMA's) which are the subject of the proposed combination.

---

<sup>3/</sup> Each applicant would be required to make the showing in its application, and applications would be accepted and acted upon on a first-come, first-served basis. See FNPRM, Para. 123. This would be fair to all stations in every market, because each licensee would learn of the possibility for television station combinations at the same time.

<sup>4/</sup> The concept of "independent" media is explained on page 10, below.



2) Other TV broadcast stations which are "significantly viewed" in the local market. For this purpose, the Commission would use as a standard for "significantly viewed" status the standard defined in Section 76.5(i) of the Commission's rules. To qualify as a "competing media" under this test, a TV broadcast station would have to be significantly viewed in the county (or counties, if applicable) where the city(ies) of license of the two stations which are the subject of the proposed combination are situated.<sup>5/</sup>

3) Low power television station ("LPTV") which are either (i) licensed to the same community as either of the television broadcast stations which are the subject of the proposed

---

<sup>5/</sup> Under Section 76.5(i) of the Rules, a network affiliated station is considered "significantly viewed" if it achieves a 25% net weekly circulation and 3% share of total viewing hours. For non-network affiliates, the standard is a 5% net weekly circulation and 2% share of viewing hours. Section 76.54 of the Rules requires that the station either (i) be shown as significantly viewed in the Commission's list of such stations in Appendix A to Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of Cable Television Report and Order, FCC 72-530, 36 FCC 2d 326 (1972) based on audience surveys taken in 1970-1971; or (ii) be based on multiple countywide audience ratings achieved within the first three years of the station's operation, or on properly conducted community-wide audience ratings taken at any time. For current purposes, Louisiana suggests that stations be deemed significantly viewed based on either the Commission's 1970-1971 survey or on multiple countywide surveys taken at any time.

combination, or (ii) located in the county which includes the community of license of either of the stations which are the subject of the proposed combination, but (in such case) only if the LPTV facility meets the Commission's standards for "significantly viewed" status as set forth in Section 76.5(i) of the Rules. If the television stations proposed for merger are licensed to communities in different counties, an LPTV station not licensed to one of those communities, in order to be considered as a "competing media," would be required to be significantly viewed in both counties.

4) Cable television, where the county (or counties) which includes the community of license of the television broadcast stations which are the subject of the proposed combination, has a home cable penetration rate which exceeds 25%.

5) Other video services (e.g., DBS, wireless cable, MMDS, etc.), where such video services provide effective competition to the proposed television broadcast station combination. For these purposes, such other providers would be deemed to provide "effective competition" if the multichannel video programming distributors (12 or more channels) provided service to at least 5% of potential subscribers (total) in the DMA.

6) Local daily newspapers of general circulation published in the community of license of either of the stations which are the subject of the proposed merger. For these purposes, the Commission should use consider as a daily newspaper of general circulation newspapers which meet the definition contained in Note 6 to Section 73.3555 of the Rules.

Under this "market-by-market" approach, an applicant which proposed to create a UHF/UHF or UHF/VHF combination would be required to demonstrate the existence of a specified number (to be determined by the Commission) of competing media which are completely independent of the entity (or entities) which would own the "jointly owned" television stations (i.e., the other media entities could not have any officers, directors, voting stockholders, or general partners in common with the entity(ies) owning the "jointly owned" television stations.) Subsequent changes in ownership structure which would eliminate this independence should not be allowed. Louisiana believes that where a proposed combination of two television broadcast stations (one of which is a UHF station) would leave a substantial number of other independent competing media, any diminishment in economic competition and viewpoint diversity which might result would be

outweighed by the public interest gains which would result from efficiencies brought about by the joint operation of the stations.

III. If the Commission Decides Not To Allow the Ownership of Two Television Stations in the Same Market, It Should Use the Grade A Contour of Television Stations To Determine the Existence of Prohibited Overlap.

In the FNPRM (at Para. 116), the Commission has tentatively proposed to change its rules to utilize the Grade A contours of television stations (rather than the Grade B contours) for purposes of determining whether prohibited television broadcast station overlap exists. As the Commission noted (at Para. 117), the vast majority of the parties filing comments earlier in this proceeding have made the point that the area within a station's Grade A contour provides a "substantially more realistic and accurate measure of a station's core market" than does its Grade B contour, and hence the use of the Grade A contour is more sensible to use for overlap purposes. Although Louisiana strongly supports the view that the Commission should allow the ownership of UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF combinations in the same market regardless of contour overlap, at the very least the Commission should change Section 73.3555(b) of the Rules to provide for the use of the Grade A contour of television broadcast stations in determining the existence of prohibited overlap between television stations

(UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF combinations) which are proposed for joint ownership.

IV. The Commission Should "Grandfather" Television LMA's Which Are in Existence as of the Date the New Television LMA Rules Become Effective.

In the FNPRM (at Para. 138), the FCC tentatively proposes to treat LMA's for television stations in the same way as it treats LMA's for radio stations (i.e., the agreements must be filed with the FCC and must be placed in the station public file; the LMA's stations will be treated as an "owned" station for purposes of the local and national multiple ownership rules, etc.). Louisiana agrees with the Commission's tentative proposals on this basic point. However, it disagrees with the Commission's proposal to "grandfather" only those television LMA's entered into prior to "the adoption of this Notice, subject to renewability and transferability guidelines similar to those governing radio LMA's" (footnote omitted). Id.<sup>6/</sup>

When the Commission considered the "grandfathering" issue in the context of radio station LMA's, it determined that LMA's

---

<sup>6/</sup> Although the word "Notice" appears as a defined term in the FNPRM, and refers to the Commission's 1992 Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 7 FCC Rcd 4111, Louisiana assumes that this reference is in error, and that the reference to "this Notice" is in fact intended to refer to the FNPRM, which was adopted on December 15, 1994.

entered into prior to the effective date of the applicable rules would be grandfathered (subject to certain conditions regarding renewability, assignability, etc.) Memorandum Opinion and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, In re Revision of Radio Rules and Policies, MM Docket No. 91-140, 7 FCC Rcd 6387, at 6402 (1992), and Second Memorandum Opinion and Order, MM Docket No. 91-140, 9 FCC Rcd 7183, at 7192 (1994). Louisiana believes that the approach taken by the Commission in the context of radio station LMA's makes good sense, and that there is no good reason to distinguish between TV and radio LMA's by refusing to grandfather television station LMA's which are entered after the adoption of the FNPRM (December 15, 1994) but before the effective date of the applicable television LMA rules.

Moreover, Louisiana believes that the approach taken by the Commission in the radio LMA situation was fair, and that the proposed approach in the FNPRM to the television LMA situation is unfair. Louisiana believes that certain parties with informal contacts with the Commission's staff had advance notice that the FNPRM would be adopted on December 15, 1994, and that LMA's were rushed and entered immediately prior thereto, and in reliance on such information, in order to achieve "grandfathered" status. While Louisiana does not suggest that either such parties or any

members of the Commission's staff acted improperly or unethically in this regard, Louisiana sees no reason why those members of the public who took advantage of "insider contacts" should be allowed to benefit while those members of the public without such contacts confronted a fait accompli upon reading the FNPRM, because their right to enter a "grandfathered" television LMA was cut off without notice.

V. The Commission Should Relax the Current Prohibition on Television Broadcast Station-Newspaper Joint Ownership.

As stated previously, the owners of Louisiana also own a daily newspaper published in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. This newspaper-television station combination came into existence long before the prohibition against such joint ownership appeared in Section 73.3555(d)(3), and was "grandfathered" by the Commission.<sup>1/</sup> Therefore, the relaxation of the Commission's current newspaper-television station prohibition would have no effect on Louisiana's current ownership situation in Baton Rouge.

Nevertheless, Louisiana takes this opportunity to express its belief that the Commission's absolute newspaper-television station

---

<sup>1/</sup> Second Report and Order, Amendment of Sections 73.34, 73.240 and 73.636 of the Commission's Rules Relating to Multiple Ownership of Standard, FM, and Television Broadcast Stations, 50 FCC 2d 1046 (1975).

cross-ownership prohibition disserves the public interest and should be revisited by the Commission in the context of this proceeding. The same arguments which have led the Commission to reconsider the other multiple ownership restrictions applicable to television (e.g., the TV-TV prohibition and the radio-TV prohibition) are also applicable to television stations in the context of television-newspaper cross-ownership prohibition. With the explosion of competing voices and advertising outlets on the American scene within the past few years, and with more offerings coming on the scene at an increasingly rapid pace, the need for, and the utility of, the absolute prohibition on joint newspaper-television ownership no longer exists (assuming such justification once existed). Louisiana believes that the Commission should revise Section 73.3555(d)(3) of the Rules to allow a single entity to own both a daily newspaper of general circulation and television stations (whether VHF or UHF station) where substantial independent competitive media would exist after the creation of the newspaper-



television combination. Louisiana's views on what constitutes "substantial independent competitive media" are the same in this context as as have been set forth above in Section II of these Comments regarding the creation of UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF combinations.

Respectfully submitted

LOUISIANA TELEVISION BROADCASTING CORP.

By:

Robert B. Jacobi (for)

Robert B. Jacobi

Lawrence N. Cohn

Cohn and Marks

1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.

Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20036

Telephone: 202/293-3860

Its Counsel

Dated: May 17, 1995